AMENDED IN SENATE APRIL 8, 2008 AMENDED IN SENATE MARCH 24, 2008

SENATE BILL

No. 1267

Introduced by Senator Yee

February 19, 2008

An act to amend Sections 8547.2, 8547.8, 19683, and 19683.5 of the Government Code, relating to whistleblower protections.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 1267, as amended, Yee. Whistleblower protection.

(1) The California Whistleblower Protection Act authorizes a state employee or an applicant for state employment to file a complaint, as specified, with the State Personnel Board alleging reprisal, retaliation, threats, coercion, or similar improper conduct prohibited under the act. Under that act, once it has been demonstrated by a preponderance of the evidence that conduct protected by the act was a contributing factor to the alleged retaliation against the complaining party, the supervisor, manager, or appointing power is required to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the alleged action would have occurred for legitimate, independent reasons.

This bill would in addition provide that the act applies to former employees, as specified.

This bill would require the *administrative law* judge in *a civil or* an administrative action filed on or after January 1, 2009, to make a finding after the plaintiff has completed presenting the evidence in his or her case in chief, of whether the plaintiff demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence that an activity—prohibited protected by the California Whistleblower Protection Act was a contributing factor in the alleged retaliation.

SB 1267 -2-

This bill would also require the board, through its executive officer, to determine within 10 working days of the submission date of a complaint filed for which the board initiates an investigation, whether the complaint and any materials submitted with it demonstrates by a preponderance of evidence that an activity-prohibited protected by the act was a contributing factor in the alleged retaliation.

(2) Existing law requires the State Personnel Board to initiate a hearing or investigation of a written complaint of reprisal or retaliation that is prohibited by the California Whistleblower Protection Act within 10 working days of its submission. The executive officer is required to complete findings of the hearing or investigation within 60 working days thereafter and provide a copy of the findings to the complaining state employee or applicant for state employment and to the appropriate supervisor, manager, employee, or appointing authority. When the allegations contained in a complaint of reprisal or retaliation are the same as, or similar to, those contained in another appeal, the executive officer may consolidate the appeals into the most appropriate form.

This bill would provide that complaints may be consolidated only with the written consent of the *complaining* party or parties. The bill would also prohibit the continuing of a matter if it would exceed the 60-working-day timeframe cause the dispute to continue in an undecided state beyond 70 working days of the complaint's submission. Additionally, the bill would divest the board of jurisdiction if the executive officer fails to complete the findings within-60 70 working days of the complaint's submission, and would then require the board to issue a right-to-sue notice to the complaining party.

(3) Existing law permits the supervisor, manager, employee, or appointing power to request a hearing before the State Personnel Board regarding the findings of the executive officer if the executive officer finds that the supervisor, manager, employee, or appointing power retaliated against the complainant for engaging in protected whistleblower activities. Existing law provides that if, after that hearing, the State Personnel Board determines that a violation of the California Whistleblower Protection Act occurred, or if no hearing is requested and the findings of the executive officer conclude that improper activity has occurred, the board may order any appropriate relief.

This bill would specify that appropriate relief may include attorney's fees, expert witness fees, and costs for successful prosecution of a retaliation complaint before the board.

-3- SB 1267

(4) Existing law requires a public entity that provides for the defense of a state employee charged with a violation of the California Whistleblower Protection Act to reserve all rights to be reimbursed for any costs incurred in that defense. If a state employee is found to have violated the act, he or she is liable for all defense costs and is required to reimburse the public entity for those costs.

This bill would provide that if a state employee is successful in an action brought before the board pursuant to those provisions, the complaining employee shall be reimbursed for all costs incurred, including attorney's fees.

This bill would also require the administrative law judge to make any orders as that may appear just in order to prevent any named party from being embarrassed, delayed, or put to undue unnecessary expense, and may make other orders as the interests of justice may require during the administrative process, in all cases.

The bill would also make technical, conforming changes to those provisions.

Vote: majority. Appropriation: no. Fiscal committee: yes. State-mandated local program: no.

1

2

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

- SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares the following:
 (a) It is the public policy of this state to protect and safeguard the right and freedom of all former, current, and prospective public employees, as well as members of the public interacting with state government, the California State University, and the University of California to report waste, fraud, abuse of authority, violation of law, or threat to public health and safety without restraint or fear of retribution or actual retribution due to having engaged in
- (b) Public servants best serve the citizenry when they can be candid and honest without reservation in conducting the people's business.

a protected disclosure reporting those government improprieties.

(c) The practice of restraining and retaliating against public servants by denying employment or contractual opportunity, creating hostile work environments, and discriminating in the terms or conditions of employment or contract for these reasons foments domestic strife and unrest unrest and dissatisfaction, deprives the state of the fullest use of its capacities for development and

SB 1267 —4—

advancement, and substantially and adversely affects the interest of public employees, employers, and the public in general.

- (d) The practice of restraining and retaliating against others because of their protected disclosure of improper governmental activities is declared to be against public policy.
- (e) The purpose of this act is to provide effective, efficient remedies that will eliminate these retaliatory practices.
- (f) This act shall be deemed an exercise of the police power of the state for the protection of the welfare, health, and peace of the people of this state.
- SEC. 2. Section 8547.2 of the Government Code is amended to read:
 - 8547.2. For the purposes of this article:
- (a) "Employee" means any individual appointed by the Governor or employed or holding office in a state agency as defined by Section 11000, including, for purposes of Sections 8547.3 to 8547.7, inclusive, any employee of the California State University. "Employee" includes any former employee who met the criteria of this subdivision during his or her employment.
- (b) "Improper governmental activity" means any activity by a state agency or by an employee that is undertaken in the performance of the employee's official duties, whether or not that action is within the scope of his or her employment, and that (1) is in violation of any state or federal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, corruption, malfeasance, bribery, theft of government property, fraudulent claims, fraud, coercion, conversion, malicious prosecution, misuse of government property, or willful omission to perform duty, or (2) is economically wasteful, or involves gross misconduct, incompetency, or inefficiency. For purposes of Sections 8547.4, 8547.5, 8547.10, and 8547.11, "improper governmental activity" includes any activity by the University of California or by an employee, including an officer or faculty member, who otherwise meets the criteria of this subdivision.
- (c) "Person" means any individual, corporation, trust, association, any state or local government, or any agency or instrumentality of any of the foregoing.
- (d) "Protected disclosure" means any good faith communication that discloses or demonstrates an intention to disclose information that may evidence (1) an improper governmental activity or (2)

5 SB 1267

any condition that may significantly threaten the health or safety of employees or the public if the disclosure or intention to disclose was made for the purpose of remedying that condition.

- (e) "Illegal order" means any directive to violate or assist in violating a federal, state, or local law, rule, or regulation or any order to work or cause others to work in conditions outside of their line of duty that would unreasonably threaten the health or safety of employees or the public.
- (f) "State agency" is defined by Section 11000. "State agency" includes the University of California for purposes of Sections 8547.5 to 8547.7, inclusive, and the California State University for purposes of Sections 8547.3 to 8547.7, inclusive.
- SEC. 3. Section 8547.8 of the Government Code is amended to read:
- 8547.8. (a) A state employee or applicant for state employment who files a written complaint with his or her supervisor, manager, or the appointing power alleging actual or attempted acts of reprisal, retaliation, threats, coercion, or similar improper acts prohibited by Section 8547.3, may also file a copy of the written complaint with the State Personnel Board, together with a sworn statement that the contents of the written complaint are true, or are believed by the affiant to be true, under penalty of perjury. The complaint shall be filed with the board within 12 months of the most recent act of reprisal set forth in the complaint.
- (b) Any person who intentionally engages in acts of reprisal, retaliation, threats, coercion, or similar acts against a state employee or applicant for state employment for having made a protected disclosure; is subject to a fine not to exceed ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) and imprisonment in the county jail for a period not to exceed one year. Pursuant to Section 19683, any state civil service employee who intentionally engages in that conduct shall be disciplined by adverse action as provided by Section 19572.
- (c) In addition to all other penalties provided by law, any person who intentionally engages in acts of reprisal, retaliation, threats, coercion, or similar acts against a state employee or applicant for state employment for having made a protected disclosure shall be liable in an action for damages brought against him or her by the injured party. Punitive damages may be awarded by the court if the acts of the offending party are proven to be malicious. Where liability has been established, the injured party shall also be entitled

SB 1267 -6-

to reasonable attorney's fees as provided by law. However, any action for damages shall not be available to the injured party unless the injured party has first filed a complaint with the State Personnel Board pursuant to subdivision (a), and the board has issued, or failed to issue, findings pursuant to Section 19683.

- (d) This section is not intended to prevent an appointing power, manager, or supervisor from taking, directing others to take, recommending, or approving any personnel action or from taking or failing to take a personnel action with respect to any state employee or applicant for state employment if the appointing power, manager, or supervisor reasonably believes any action or inaction is justified on the basis of evidence separate and apart from the fact that the person has made a protected disclosure as defined in subdivision (d) of Section 8547.2.
- (e) (1) In any civil action or administrative proceeding, once it has been demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence that an activity protected by this article was a contributing factor in the alleged retaliation against a former, current, or prospective employee, the burden of proof shall be on the supervisor, manager, or appointing power to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that the alleged action would have occurred for legitimate, independent reasons even if the employee had not engaged in protected disclosures or refused an illegal order.
- (A) In an administrative action filed on or after January 1, 2009, the *administrative law* judge shall make a finding after the plaintiff has completed presenting the evidence in his or her case in chief, of whether the plaintiff demonstrated by a preponderance of evidence that an activity-prohibited protected by this article was a contributing factor in the alleged retaliation.
- (B) If the State Personnel Board initiates an investigation of the complaint rather than a hearing pursuant to Section 19683, the board, through its executive officer, shall determine within 10 working days of the submission date of the complaint, whether the complaint and any materials submitted with it demonstrates by a preponderance of the evidence that an activity—prohibited protected by this article was a contributing factor in the alleged retaliation. This subparagraph shall apply to a complaint filed with the board on and after January 1, 2009, that satisfies the filing requirements set forth in Section 56.1 of Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations.

7 SB 1267

(2) In an affirmative adverse action taken against an employee in which the employee demonstrates, by a preponderance of the evidence, that retaliation was a contributing factor to the adverse action taken against him or her, the employee shall have a complete affirmative defense to the adverse action.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

3738

39

40

(f) Nothing in this article shall be deemed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any employee under any other federal or state law or under any employment contract or collective bargaining agreement.

SEC. 4. Section 19683 of the Government Code is amended to read:

19683. (a) The State Personnel Board, through its executive officer, shall initiate a hearing or investigation of a written complaint of reprisal or retaliation as prohibited by Section 8547.3 within 10 working days of its submission. The executive officer shall complete findings of the hearing or investigation within 60 working days thereafter, and shall provide a copy of the findings to the complaining state employee or applicant for state employment and to the appropriate supervisor, manager, employee, or appointing authority. When the allegations contained in a complaint of reprisal or retaliation are the same as, or similar to, those contained in another appeal, the executive officer may consolidate the appeals into the most appropriate format only with the written consent of the *complaining* party or parties. Under no eircumstances shall the matter The matter shall not be continued if it will cause the dispute to continue in an undecided state beyond 60 working days. If the executive officer fails to complete the findings within 60 working days of the complaint's submission, the State Personnel Board shall be divested of its jurisdiction and shall issue a right-to-sue notice to the complaining party stating that (1) the State Personnel Board failed to make the finding as required by this subdivision within the 70-day period and (2) the complaining party may file a civil complaint with the superior court pursuant to subdivision (c) of Section 8547.8 of the Government Code.

(b) If the executive officer finds that the supervisor, manager, employee, or appointing power retaliated against the complainant for engaging in protected whistleblower activities, the supervisor, manager, employee, or appointing power may request a hearing before the State Personnel Board regarding the findings of the

SB 1267 —8—

executive officer. The request for hearing and any subsequent determination by the board shall be made in accordance with the board's normal rules governing appeals, hearings, investigations, and disciplinary proceedings.

- (c) If, after the hearing described in subdivision (b), the State Personnel Board determines that a violation of Section 8547.3 occurred, or if no hearing is requested and the findings of the executive officer conclude that improper activity has occurred, the board may order any appropriate relief, including, but not limited to, attorney's fees, expert witness fees, and costs for successful prosecution of a retaliation complaint before the State Personnel Board, reinstatement, backpay, restoration of lost service credit, if appropriate, compensatory damages, and the expungement of any adverse records of the state employee or applicant for state employment who was the subject of the alleged acts of misconduct prohibited by Section 8547.3.
- (d) Whenever the board determines that a manager, supervisor, or employee, who is named a party to the retaliation complaint, has violated Section 8547.3 and that violation constitutes legal cause for discipline under one or more subdivisions of Section 19572, it shall impose a just and proper penalty and cause an entry to that effect to be made in the manager's, supervisor's, or employee's official personnel records.
- (e) Whenever the board determines that a manager, supervisor, or employee, who is not named a party to the retaliation complaint, may have engaged in or participated in any act prohibited by Section 8547.3, the board shall notify the manager's, supervisor's, or employee's appointing power of that fact in writing. Within 60 days after receiving the notification, the appointing power shall either serve a notice of adverse action on the manager, supervisor, or employee, or set forth in writing its reasons for not taking adverse action against the manager, supervisor, or employee. The appointing power shall file a copy of the notice of adverse action with the board in accordance with Section 19574. If the appointing power declines to take adverse action against the manager, supervisor, or employee, it shall submit its written reasons for not doing so to the board, which may take adverse action against the manager, supervisor, or employee as provided in Section 19583.5. A manager, supervisor, or employee who is served with a notice

-9- SB 1267

of adverse action pursuant to this section may file an appeal with the board in accordance with Section 19575.

- (f) In order for the Governor and the Legislature to determine the need to continue or modify state personnel procedures as they relate to the investigations of reprisals or retaliation for the disclosure of information by public employees, the State Personnel Board, by June 30 of each year, shall submit a report to the Governor and the Legislature regarding complaints filed, hearings held, and legal actions taken pursuant to this section.
- (g) In all cases, including those where individually named respondents have joined in a consolidated hearing, the administrative law judge shall make any orders as that may appear just in order to prevent any named party from being embarrassed, delayed, or put to undue unnecessary expense, and may make other orders as the interests of justice may require during the administrative process.
- 17 SEC. 5. Section 19683.5 of the Government Code is amended to read:
 - 19683.5. If a state employee is successful in an action brought pursuant to Section 19683, the complaining employee shall be reimbursed for all costs incurred, including attorney's fees.